

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 15-20 are pending. The Office Action dated January 6, 2009 in this Application has been carefully considered, and the accompanying amendments and remarks have been undertaken with a view toward placing this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 2, 15, 17, 18, and 20 have been amended in this Response. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 15, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,970,924 to Chu et al. ("Chu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,225,272 to Kelley et al. ("Kelley") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,349,894 to Barth et al. ("Barth"). In light of the amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 1 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention. Claim 1 now recites:

A method of determining an Internet Protocol (IP) address of an application server in a visited serving network, comprising:
receiving an IP address associated with a device on the network by a wireless mobile device;
performing a reverse domain name query by the wireless mobile device using the received IP address;
receiving, by the wireless mobile device, a response to the reverse domain name query comprising the visited serving network domain name, wherein the network is visited by the wireless mobile device and serving the wireless mobile device;
extracting, by the wireless mobile device, the serving network domain name from the received reverse domain name query;
selecting, by the wireless mobile device, an application server name as a function of a service desired by the wireless mobile device;
appending, by the wireless mobile device, the extracted serving network domain name to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name;
performing, by the wireless mobile device, a domain name query using the domain-specific application server name; and

receiving, by the wireless mobile device, a response to the domain name query comprising a second IP address, the second IP address identifying an application server in the visited serving network, the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless mobile device.

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, at paragraphs [0005], [0008], [0017], and [0020] of the Application.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a wireless mobile device.” Chu is directed to monitoring network performance. Chu abstract. The cited portion of Chu discloses determining if a router is a boundary router. Chu column 16, lines 7-32. Chu finds boundary routers to monitor the performance of domains. Chu column 16, lines 25-32. The Office Action cites the disclosure of Chu regarding finding boundary routers as disclosing several of the limitations of Claim 1. However, Claim 1 now recites “a wireless mobile device” and “the network is visited by the wireless mobile device.” The routers of Chu are not wireless mobile devices and do not visit networks.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “selecting, by the wireless mobile device, an application server name as a function of a service desired by the wireless mobile device” and “the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless mobile device.” The Final Action cites Barth as disclosing the previous limitation of “generating, by the UE, an application server name.” The cited portion of Barth discloses dynamically constructing a server name by concatenating string fragments. Barth column 11, lines 21-26.

Assuming for the sake of argument that the server name in Barth is selected as a function of a desired service, the cited portion of Barth and the cited portion of Chu could not be combined to produce the limitation of “the second IP address identifying an application server in the visited serving network, the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless

mobile device.” Chu teaches the use of reverse domain name service lookups to determine whether a router is a boundary router. Chu column 16, lines 7-32. An application server name is not used in Chu in connection with a desired service, because application servers are not used to provide services in Chu. Instead, the response to the reverse domain name service lookup is used only to determine whether a router is a boundary router. The server name is assumed to be dynamically constructed in Barth as a function of a desired service. However, Chu would not provide a way to obtain the desired service. Rather, Chu would provide a way to determine if a router is a boundary router. Thus, the combination of Chu and Barth would not produce the limitation of “the second IP address identifying an application server in the visited serving network, the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless mobile device.”

The Final Action cites Chu as disclosing the previous limitation of “performing, by the UE, a domain name query as a function of the domain-specific application server name.” The Final Action quotes Chu column 16, lines 14-17 and column 16, lines 19-22 as disclosing this limitation.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “performing a domain name query using the domain-specific application server name.” Chu column 16, lines 14-17 state: “For instance, a router with links named ‘host1.inverse.net’ and ‘host2.alter.net’ may be situated on the administrative boundary between ‘inverse.net’ and ‘alter.net’.” This statement is made in the context of how a reverse DNS lookup may be used to determine boundary routers. Chu column 16, lines 7-17. The reverse DNS lookup is performed “on each IP address.” Chu column 16, lines 10-13. The reverse DNS lookup is not performed “using the domain-specific application server name” as recited by Claim 1.

Chu column 16, lines 19-22 state: “A central server, such as the server at whois.internic.net, can be queried for the owner **of a given IP address**. Whois requests **return domain names**.” (emphasis added). In other words, the whois request is performed using a given IP address to

produce a domain name. Thus, Chu does not disclose “performing a domain name query using the domain-specific application server name.” Rather, Chu discloses performing a reverse domain name query or whois request, both of which use IP addresses.

The Final Action cites Chu as disclosing the previous limitation of “receiving...a second IP address as a function of the domain-specific application server name.” The Final Action quotes lines 10-13 of Chu as disclosing this limitation. However, lines 10-13 of Chu state that “[p]erforming a reverse DNS lookup on each IP address returns **strings representing host names** for links (e.g. 208.218.140.5 may map to **inverse-gwl.alter.net**).” (emphasis added). Thus, the reverse DNS lookup would return a string (such as inverse-gwl.alter.net), not an IP address.

Thus, Chu does not disclose the limitation of “receiving, by the wireless mobile device, a response to the domain name query comprising a second IP address, the second IP address identifying an application server in the visited serving network, the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless mobile device.”

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that the cited references do not teach the unique combination now recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 1 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over these references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-3 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 2-3 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claim 2-3 also be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 15 as now amended more particularly recites one of the distinguishing characteristics of the present invention. Claim 15 now recites:

A system for determining an Internet Protocol (IP) address of an application server in a visited serving network, comprising:
a wireless mobile device in communication with an access gateway of the serving network, wherein the wireless mobile device is configured to:
request an IP address associated with a device on the network from the serving network;
receive the requested IP address;
perform a reverse domain name query using the received IP address;
receive a response to the reverse domain name query comprising the visited serving network domain name, wherein the network is visited by the wireless mobile device and serving the wireless mobile device;
extract the serving network domain name information from the reverse domain name query;
select an application server name as a function of a service desired by the wireless mobile device;
append the extracted serving network domain name information to the application server name, thereby generating a domain-specific application server name;
perform a domain name query using the domain-specific application server name; and
receive a response to the domain name query comprising a second IP address, the second IP address identifying an application server in the visiting serving network, the application server capable of providing the service desired by the wireless mobile device.

Support for this Amendment can be found, among other places, at paragraphs [0005], [0008], [0017], and [0020] of the Application. Applicants contend that the rejection of amended Claim 15 is overcome for at least some of the reasons by which the rejection of Claim 1 as amended is overcome, as discussed above in the remarks for Claim 1. Applicants therefore submit that amended Claim 15 is clearly and precisely distinguishable over the cited references in a patentable sense, and is therefore allowable over these references and the remaining references of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and that Claim 15 be allowed.

Claims 4-6 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of Kelley and Barth in further view of Official Notice.

Claims 4-6 depend from and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 1 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 4-6 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 4-6 also be withdrawn.

Claims 16-19 depend from and further limit Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 15 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claims 16-19 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claims 16-19 also be withdrawn.

Rejected independent Claim 20 has been amended to depend from and further limit Claim 15. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons that Claim 15 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance, Claim 20 should be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 20 also be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and distinguishing remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1-6 and 15-20 as presented herein.

Applicants hereby request continued examination and hereby authorize the Director to charge the required fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP. Applicants do not believe that any other fees are due; however, in the event that any other fees are due, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP. Should the Examiner have any concern or uncertainty as to any of the foregoing amendments or remarks, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: March 6, 2009
CARR LLP
670 Founders Square
900 Jackson Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 760-3030
Fax: (214) 760-3003

/Gregory W. Carr/
Gregory W. Carr
Reg. No. 31,093